DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 423 723 FL 801 262

AUTHOR	Keltner, Autumn
TITLE	English Language Training Program Self-Review: A Tool for Program Improvement. ELT: Technical Assistance for English Language Training Projects, 1997-1998.
INSTITUTION	Spring Inst. for International Studies, Wheat Ridge, CO.; Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System, San Diego, CA.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Refugee Resettlement (DHHS), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	41p.; "In collaboration with ELT Partners."
PUB TYPE	Guides - Non-Classroom (055)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Accountability; Adult Education; Curriculum Development; *English (Second Language); Evaluation Criteria; Evaluation Methods; Outcomes of Education; Professional Development; *Program Development; *Program Evaluation; *Refugees; School Community Relationship; Second Language Instruction; *Second Language Programs; *Student Evaluation; Student Personnel Services; Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

The English language training (ELT) program self-review document provides a framework for systematic and consistent self-evaluation of local ELT programs, using specific quality indicators. The document is divided into eight sections, each defining a major component or area of responsibility for effective ELT operation: program planning; professional development; curriculum development; assessment for student placement; assessment for monitoring progress; accountability for student outcomes; classroom instruction; student support services; and community involvement and collaboration. The 15 quality indicators used describe critical elements typically found in exemplary programs; each program component includes one or more quality indicators, as appropriate to the implementation of that component. Each quality indicator is followed by four sets of scoring criteria that provide benchmarks for performance. Sample measures accompanying each of the indicators provide examples of evidence of the extent to which the indicator is being achieved or practices. An introductory section offers suggestions for conducting a successful self-review. (MSE) (Adjunct ERIC Clearinghouse on Literacy Education)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 423 723

Spring Institute for International Studies

E L T

Technical Assistance for
English Language Training Projects
1997-1998

Sponsored by the
Office of Refugee Resettlement

English Language Training Program Self-Review

A tool for program improvement

Prepared by

Autumn Keltner
Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS)

In Collaboration with ELT Partners

Shirley Brod, Spring Institute for International Studies
Burna L. Dunn, Spring Institute for International Studies
Myrna Ann Adkins, Spring Institute for International Studies
Miriam Burt, Center for Applied Linguistics
Allene G. Grognet, Center for Applied Linguistics
Inaam Mansoor, Arlington Employment and Education Program
Diane Pecoraro, Minnesota Department of Education
Barbara Sample, Spring Institute for International Studies
Margaret Silver, International Institute of Metro St. Louis

FL 801262

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

1998

2

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Miriam Burt
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

Spring Institute for International Studies

E L T

Technical Assistance for
English Language Training Projects
1997-1998

Sponsored by the
Office of Refugee Resettlement

English Language Training Program Self-Review

A tool for program improvement

Prepared by

Autumn Keltner
Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS)

In Collaboration with ELT Partners

Shirley Brod, Spring Institute for International Studies
Burna L. Dunn, Spring Institute for International Studies
Myrna Ann Adkins, Spring Institute for International Studies
Miriam Burt, Center for Applied Linguistics
Allene G. Grognet, Center for Applied Linguistics
Inaam Mansoor, Arlington Employment and Education Program
Diane Pecoraro, Minnesota Department of Education
Barbara Sample, Spring Institute for International Studies
Margaret Silver, International Institute of Metro St. Louis

1998

Table of Contents

Introduction i
- Purpose
- Format
- Conducting a Successful Self-Review
- Assigning Scores
- Setting Priorities

Program Planning 1
Indicator 1. The program has a planning and review process that is ongoing and participatory, guided by evaluation, and based on a written plan.

Indicator 2. The program provides an environment that actively involves staff in decision-making processes that promote quality instruction and student attainment of performance outcomes.

Professional Development 5
Indicator 3. The program supports and encourages ongoing professional development for all staff. The program considers the needs and interests of staff and involves them in the development, implementation, and evaluation of their professional development plans.

Curriculum Development 7
Indicator 4. Curriculum and instruction are organized around student needs, aligned with the Student Performance Levels (SPLs), and based on performance-based or outcome-oriented curricula such as Mainstream English Language Training (MELT).

Indicator 5. Instructional materials appropriate to student attainment of identified priority competencies or performance outcomes are being used in the program classrooms.

Assessment: Student Placement 11
Indicator 6. The program has a process for assessing and placing students in appropriate classes consistent with their needs, goals, and abilities (life skill and language).

Assessment: Monitoring Progress 13
Indicator 7. The program regularly monitors learners' progress toward attainment of language skills and competencies that support their identified needs and goals.

Accountability: Student Outcomes 15
Indicator 8. The program, whether federally, state, or privately-funded, is accountable to its students and to its funding sources. There is a standardized process for documenting and reporting learners' attainment of performance outcomes and completion of program requirements.

Classroom Instruction.....17
Indicator 9. Classroom instructional activities focus on teaching language for communicative competence.

Indicator l0. Lessons in the program's classrooms reflect adult learning theory that indicates that learning is more rapid when instruction is relevant and immediately applicable to learners' lives.

Indicator 11. Lessons in the program's classrooms are effectively organized and delivered.

Indicator 12. Instructor monitoring and classroom communication activities result in a learner-centered classroom in which students take active roles in their own learning processes.

Indicator 13. Instructional strategies reflect an awareness of individual student learning styles which leads to an effective learning environment.

Student Support Services.....27
Indicator 14. Guidance and counseling are an integral part of the agency's overall program either through direct service or through a referral network to other service providers who can serve that function. There is a process in place for the exchange of learner information among those who provide instruction, vocational training, employment referral, and/or other support services.

Community Involvement and Collaboration.....29
Indicator 15. Programs enter into formal or informal collaborative agreements with potential employers, community businesses and other agencies to promote the program mission and student/community involvement.

Summary Profile Sheet.....31

Setting Priorities.....32

References.....33

ELT Program Self-Review Document
Introduction

- **Purpose**

This ELT Program Self-Review (ELT/PSR) document provides a framework for systematic and consistent self-evaluation of local English language training programs in terms of quality criteria. The intent is for program staff to use the document to assess where their program is in relation to the criteria provided. Programs which have been in operation for several years may rate themselves exemplary for many of the indicators, while newer, smaller programs may have difficulty rating themselves exemplary in any area. However, all programs should be striving to find ways for reaching the appropriate exemplary model.

By involving all staff in actively participating in the implementation of a review process on a regular basis, agencies will be able to collaboratively identify their own priority program and instructional needs and develop mutually agreed upon action plans to address program improvement. The overall summary program profile sheet at the end of the document becomes baseline information that can later be reassessed to determine the program's progress toward achieving cooperatively-identified goals.

- **Format**

1) Program components
The ELT/PSR document is divided into eight sections. Each of these sections defines a major component or area of responsibility for effective ELT program operation: The sections are: Program Planning, Professional Development, Curriculum Development, Assessment: Student Placement, Assessment: Monitoring Progress, Accountability: Student Outcomes, Classroom Instruction, Student Support Services, and Community Involvement and Collaboration.

2) Quality indicators
There are 15 quality indicators or standards of excellence included in the ELT/PSR document. These indicators describe critical elements which are typically found in exemplary programs. Each program component, or area of responsibility, includes one or more quality indicators as appropriate to the implementation of that component.

3) Scoring criteria
Each quality indicator is followed by four sets of scoring criteria, ranging on a scale of one to four, four being the highest rating. These criteria provide a series of benchmarks leading to achievement of the ideal or best practice. During the development of these benchmarks, consideration was given to the range of conditions under which ELT programs operate. Consideration was also given to the variety of organizational structures and types of classes and programs in which refugee students are enrolled. It is not expected that all indicators and criteria will be applicable to all programs. Nor is it expected that many programs will rate themselves a four for all or even most of the quality indicators.

4) Sample measures
Sample measures listed on the pages following each of the indicators provide examples of evidence of the extent to which the indicator is being achieved or practiced. Usually, the more evidence there is that the indicator is in practice, the higher the rating that can be assigned. However, it is not expected that all of the measures must be in practice to achieve a score of three or four.

• Conducting a Successful Self-Review

1) Provide an opportunity for all staff members to participate in a discussion of the purpose of the self-review process and an overview and walk-through of the document. Allow ample time for questions, definitions and clarifications of terms, and development of timelines and plans for completion of the review process.

2) Identify a member of the staff to act as a facilitator for the review process. The facilitator then guides the staff in carefully reading each indicator and the scoring criteria for the indicator.

3) Have participants review the four criteria for each of the indicators, compare their program implementation to the criteria listed and then assign a local program score for each of the indicators. Scores should be based on each person's own perceptions of the program as a whole, not solely on their own personal practices.

Note: Some agencies prefer to have participants assign scores independently and then discuss and agree on a group consensus rating for each of the indicators. Other agencies have participants score the indicators collectively, either working in teams or as a total group. Both methods seem to obtain meaningful results. (See page iii for additional information as to the process for assigning scores for each indicator.)

- **Assigning Scores or Ratings**

1) Carefully read each indicator and each of the four criteria listed below the indicator. Then review and compare local agency practices to each of the scoring criteria.

2) Use the sample measures on the page following each indicator to determine the extent to which the indicator is present or being achieved in the local program. The sample measures provide suggestions as to how evidence of meeting the criteria can be documented. Programs may have alternative ways of documenting the criteria, depending on size of the program, funding, needs, and goals of the learners, etc.

3) Assign a score (overall rating) of 4, 3, 2, or 1 for each of the indicators. A 4 rating is considered exemplary or beyond the norm while a 2 or 1 rating would indicate a need for improvement. A marking of N/A, not applicable, may be used in cases where the indicator is not appropriate for a specific type of program. Written comments should support the decision to mark an indicator as N/A.

4) Transfer consensus scores for each of the indicators to the Summary Profile Sheet on page 31 of the document.

- **Setting Priorities**

1) Have participants collectively complete a consensus Summary Profile Sheet (see page 31).

2) Using the information from the Summary Profile Sheet, the facilitator leads a priority-setting process to identify the program's areas of strength and areas which they consider to be in need of improvement.

3) Participants use the Setting Priorities form (page 32) to determine priorities for program improvement. They then develop an action plan for addressing their identified priority indicators. Action plans should include identifying: 1) technical assistance needs, 2) projected fiscal impact, if any, 3) timelines, and 4) individual staff member's responsibilities.

There is a great variety in goals, objectives and funding levels of programs providing ELT services to refugees nationwide. It is not expected that this document can fully address the entire range of quality indicators for these programs nor is it expected that all indicators will be appropriate for all programs. However, it is hoped that the process of using this document to implement a collaborative self-assessment will provide useful information for any program desiring to improve the quality of services being provided and the outcomes being achieved.

Program Planning

Indicator 1. The program has a planning and review process that is on-going and participatory, guided by evaluation, and based on a written plan.

Scoring Criteria

4. Most of the program's stakeholders* are involved in the program's planning and review process. Community and student needs, demographics, resources, and economic and job market trends are assessed, and the data collected is integrated into a written program plan. The program plan includes an agreed upon statement of program purpose, including life skills/employability and language development goals and objectives. The program staff regularly reviews its program evaluation information, including student outcome data and provides this information to all stakeholders. This information is used to facilitate program improvement.

3. Many of the program stakeholders are involved in the program's planning and review process. The program plan may include some, but not all, of the following indicators: community and student needs, demographics, resources, and economic and job market trends. Program purposes and life skill and language development goals and objectives may have been discussed, but written statements are not available. Program evaluation information is reviewed and reported to staff, but not necessarily to students or other stakeholders.

2. Only some of the program stakeholders are involved in a program planning and review process. The program plan includes only a few key indicators and is limited in focus. Program evaluation information is not usually shared with staff, students, or other stakeholders and is not used to facilitate program improvement.

1. Few, if any, of the program stakeholders are involved in a program planning and review process. Written statements of program purposes, goals, and objectives have not been developed. Program evaluation information may not be collected or reported.

* Stakeholders include, but are not limited to, representatives of instructional and support staff, students, community, potential employers, business and civic organizations, advisory groups, school boards, boards of directors, and program funders.

Program Planning

Sample Measures

The following are sample measures for determining the extent to which Indicator 1 is present or achieved:

- A written plan is available. Program stakeholders have been part of a program planning and review process.
- Evidence is available which indicates that program evaluation information, community, job market and student information, and current student outcome data and curricular documents are included in the program plan and reviewed for program planning.
- The program plan includes statements of life/employability skills and language development goals and objectives.
- The program plan, program evaluation information, community and student information and outcome data have been disseminated to stakeholders.
- Staff, student, and community member interviews indicate active involvement of stakeholders in the development of a written program plan.

Overall Rating (circle one)

4 3 2 1

Comments:

Program Planning

Indicator 2. The program provides an environment that actively involves staff in decision-making processes that promote quality instruction and student attainment of performance outcomes.

Scoring Criteria

4. All staff are provided the opportunity to participate in problem-solving and decision-making processes concerning curriculum, instruction, assessment, professional development, program evaluation, and other policy matters. Instructors have input into the selection of and access to appropriate instructional and support materials that address identified student needs and goals and enhance the quality of instruction.

3. Staff may participate in some aspects of decision-making processes concerning curriculum, instruction, assessment, professional development, program evaluation, and other policy matters. Instructors usually have input into selection of instructional and support materials.

2. A limited number of staff may participate in some aspects of decision-making processes. Instructors have input into selection of some, but not all instructional and support materials.

1. Decision-making and problem-solving related to the instructional program are solely administrative responsibilities. Instructors have little or no input into the selection of instructional and support materials.

Program Planning

Sample Measures

The following are sample measures for determining the extent to which Indicator 2 is present or achieved:

- Meeting notes or agendas provide evidence of staff participation in key decision-making processes, e.g. curriculum, instruction, instructional materials, assessment, professional development, and program evaluation.
- Staff interviews indicate active involvement of staff in key decision-making processes.
- Program policies or statements of practice provide evidence of staff participation in key decision-making processes.
- Community reports, program report cards, and reports to teachers document key decision-making processes.

Overall Rating (circle one)

4 3 2 1

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Professional Development

Indicator 3. The program supports and encourages on-going professional development for all staff. The program considers the needs and interests of staff and involves them in the development, implementation, and evaluation of their professional development plans.

Scoring Criteria

4. Staff and administration develop individualized professional development plans that are linked to their identified needs, program goals and priorities, and student achievement. Professional development opportunities are made available on a regular basis. options offered are varied to address the needs and experience of staff, as well as program goals. As staff turnovers occur, provisions are made for orientation and professional development options for new staff.

3. Staff and administration may create professional development plans, but implementation of these plans may be inconsistent. Professional development options may not be available on a regular basis.

2. The professional development plan is developed independently by program administration and may not be based on identified staff needs. Professional development options are not available on a regular basis.

1. No professional development plan exists.

Professional Development

Sample Measures

The following are sample measures for determining the extent to which Indicator 3 is present or achieved:

- Written professional development plans exist.
- Schedules or announcements of professional development activities and opportunities are available to all staff.
- A record is kept on file of staff members' participation in professional development activities and recognition is regularly given to staff members for their participation.
- Instructor interviews provide evidence of availability of professional development opportunities..
- Peer mentoring plan is in place.

Overall Rating (circle one)

4 3 2 1

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Curriculum Development

Indicator 4. Curriculum and instruction are organized around student needs, aligned with the Student Performance Levels (SPLs)*, and based on performance-based or outcome-oriented curricula such as MELT.**

Scoring Criteria

4. Each instructor has a copy of a course of study outline for the course(s) taught, and the lessons observed clearly relate to this plan. The curriculum is aligned with appropriate proficiency levels and performance standards. If more than one course is offered, there is a planned, articulated sequence of courses. The curriculum is clearly consistent with student mastery of identified performance outcomes. Curriculum outlines and performance outcome expectations are discussed with students.

3. Instructors have access to a written course of study. Course outlines are in place to guide lesson planning, and in most cases the relationship from one lesson to the next lesson is clear. The curriculum largely aligns with appropriate performance standards. Curriculum is generally consistent with student mastery of identified priority outcomes. Curriculum and standards may not be discussed with students.

2. Course of study outlines exist, but instructors either are not aware of or do not use them. Lessons observed minimally address attainment of performance outcomes. A sequenced curriculum plan is not evident in the classrooms.

1. A course of study outline, if accessible, is not being addressed. The curriculum specified in the plan is not being implemented in the classroom(s). Course of study outlines, if available, do not reflect a logical, articulated sequence of language instruction. Curriculum does not specify priority competencies or outcomes.

* Student Performance Levels (SPLs): general descriptions of language ability with respect to listening, speaking, reading and writing developed through the Mainstream English Language Training (MELT) project funded under a grant from the Federal office of Refugee Resettlement.
** Mainstream English Language Training project funded under a grant from the Federal office of Refugee Resettlement.

Curriculum Development

Sample Measures

The following are sample measures for determining the extent to which Indicator 4 is present or achieved:

- There are accessible, sequenced course of study outlines.
- Classroom observation provides evidence that curriculum and instruction are focused on students' needs and attainment of priority performance outcomes.
- Lesson plans reflect a planned, logical, and articulated sequence of learning experiences.
- Priority outcome statements have been integrated into courses of study.
- Curriculum meeting notes or agendas reflect response to student needs.
- Student interviews provide evidence that curriculum and instruction focus on meeting student needs.

Overall Rating (circle one)

4 3 2 1

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Curriculum Development

Indicator 5. Instructional materials appropriate to student attainment of identified priority competencies or performance outcomes are being used in the program classrooms.

Scoring Criteria

4. Instructional materials are carefully selected to meet criteria specified and in all cases support the objectives of the lesson. Alternative materials are available and used with learners at different levels of proficiency. The materials closely match lesson objectives, and provide for real life applications of learning. There are enough materials for all students to use. Instructors supplement texts with audio-visual support materials and activities and do not rely solely on texts for classroom instruction.

3. Instructors rely largely on texts and handouts for classroom instruction. In most classes, the materials used support the attainment of identified competency objectives. Materials are appropriate for most students. The materials, in general, appear appropriate in format, adult orientation, and without bias. There are enough materials for all students to use.

2. Instructional materials used in the program's classrooms sometimes relate to the lesson objectives, but at other times it is unclear how the materials support student needs and lesson goals. Some materials clearly relate to lesson objectives, but others appear unrelated. There is evidence of some attempt to ensure that materials are appropriate in format, adult orientation, and without bias. In most cases, there are enough materials for all students to use.

1. Many of the materials used in the classes appear inappropriate, unrelated to the lesson objectives, and not relevant to practicing, achieving or applying priority competencies. Appropriate materials may not be available for all students.

Curriculum Development

Sample Measures

The following are sample measures for determining the extent to which Indicator 5 is present or achieved:

- Evaluation of materials is based on the following criteria:
  - > levels of difficulty
  - > relevance to identified performance outcomes
  - > adult orientation
  - > lack of bias (culture, race, age, sex)
  - > appropriate print and format

- Lists of classroom materials provide documentation of a relationship between the materials and the above specifications.

- Classroom observation provides evidence that there are sufficient and appropriate instructional materials.

- Student interviews provide evidence that instructional materials are appropriate for students..

Overall Rating (circle one)

4 3 2 1

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Assessment: Student Placement

Indicator 6. The program has a process for assessing and placing students in appropriate classes consistent with their needs, goals, and abilities (life skill and language).

Scoring Criteria

4. If more than one level of instruction is offered, the program uses multiple measures* to assess students' listening, speaking, reading and writing skills for placement into appropriate levels of instruction. Assessment results are used to guide and enroll students in appropriate classes based on identified life skill and language needs and goals. The staff is trained to identify and administer appropriate assessment instruments and use the assessment results for student placement.

3. There is assessment of students for placement into most classes. Assessment results may be based on only one measure. Results are used to guide and enroll students in appropriate classes and monitor their progress. Identification of student needs and goals is inconsistent. Training provided to staff in the administration of appropriate assessment and the use of results is minimal.

2. There is minimal assessment for student placement.

1. There is no specified assessment for placement into classes.

*multiple measures: use of a variety of assessment instruments such as oral interviews, questionnaires, standardized and non-standardized tests, and performance measures to identify learners' abilities in various aspects of proficiency in English.

Assessment: Student Placement

Sample Measures

The following are sample measures for determining the extent to which Indicator 6 is present or achieved:

- There is evidence of student placement based on multiple measures of assessment.
- Student intake and pre-enrollment appraisal forms provide evidence of placement process.
- There is evidence of correlation between appraisal score(s) and classroom placement.
- Interviews with intake staff and students document steps in placement process.

Overall Rating (circle one)

4 3 2 1

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Assessment: Monitoring Progress

Indicator 7. The program regularly monitors learners' progress toward attainment of language skills and competencies that support their identified needs and goals.

Scoring Criteria

4. Progress is monitored and documented on a regular basis, using a variety of formal and informal (alternative) measures that assess attainment of priority instructional outcomes. Learners demonstrate performance of language in a life skills/employability context (what they can do using English) rather than what they know about English, (performance on a grammar test). Regular feedback on progress is provided to learners.

3. Progress is monitored and documented inconsistently using a limited number of measures. Assessment is intermittently scheduled or performed at teacher or student request. Focus of assessment may vary.

2. Monitoring of progress is erratic. The assessment process is not formalized and is based on the use of only one measure. Assessment may focus only on basic skills rather than on a real life application of those skills.

1. Monitoring of progress toward attainment of skills and competencies is fragmented and occurs only at instructor discretion. No standards or criteria are in place.

Assessment: Monitoring Progress

Sample Measures

The following are sample measures for determining the extent to which Indicator 7 is present or achieved:

- There is documented evidence of test score gains.
- Instructors' records document student gains or improvements in course competencies.
- Student progress toward attainment of identified goals is documented.
- Certificates of progress or attainment of specified outcomes are given to students.
- Instructors' records of alternative assessment: portfolios, performance assessment, student reports of attainment: logs, journals, etc., documentation of improvement in specific skills, observation check lists document ongoing monitoring of progress.
- There is an established schedule of student assessment procedures.

Overall Rating (circle one)

4 3 2 1

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Accountability: Student Outcomes

Indicator 8. The program, whether federally, state, or privately-funded, is accountable to its students and to its funding sources. There is a standardized process for documenting and reporting learners' attainment of performance outcomes and completion of program requirements.

Scoring Criteria

4. The program uses standardized criteria to promote and document learners' progress/promotion to higher levels of learning or training and the attainment of performance outcomes. Documentation of advancement or completion is based on a variety of assessment measures that assess learners' acquisition of language skills as well as competency attainment.

3. The program promotes student attainment of performance outcomes. Documentation of attainment of competencies and program completion is in place. Advancement may not be based on standardized criteria or multiple measures of assessment.

2. Criteria for movement through the program or program exit show little relationship to attainment of specific outcomes. Documentation of competency attainment is limited. Minimal data are collected.

1. Validation and documentation of competency attainment occurs inconsistently, or not at all. No organized data collection process is in place.

Accountability: Student Outcomes

Sample Measures

The following are sample measures for determining the extent to which Indicator 8 is present or achieved:

- Documentation of student advancement to a higher level of skill or competency in the program provides evidence of a standardized process.
- Certification of priority competency attainment or proficiency is based on standardized criteria.
- There is evidence of student employment or advancement in the workplace.
- There is documented evidence of student transition from one program to another.
- There is evidence of aggregated program exit and follow-up data.

Overall Rating (circle one)

4 3 2 1

Comments:

Curriculum and Instruction

Indicator 9. Classroom instructional activities focus on teaching language for communicative competence.

Scoring Criteria

4. Instructors integrate the four language skills, listening, speaking, reading and writing in each lesson, focusing on the development of comprehension (listening and reading) before production (speaking and writing) processes. Student interaction activities provide learners with opportunities to apply their language skills in a variety of meaningful communication situations.

3. Instructors usually make an effort to include all four language skills in each lesson; however, some skills may receive little emphasis. Interaction activities are integrated but may not always involve authentic language or meaningful communication. Adequate time for listening activities may not always precede oral production.

2. Instructors may not be consistent in providing opportunities for students to aurally comprehend language before being asked to produce it. Students sometimes participate in interaction activities which are not relevant or meaningful to them. only one or two language skills may be addressed.

1. Instructors make little attempt to address all four language skills. Learners are often asked to produce language which they have not previously been exposed to aurally.

Curriculum and Instruction

Sample Measures

The following are sample measures for determining the extent to which Indicator 9 is present or achieved.

Instructional activities in the program's classrooms focus on teaching language for communicative competence as evidenced by:

- Lesson plans
- Classroom observations
- Results of student interviews/surveys/evaluations
- Instructor self-monitoring/self-evaluation

Overall Rating (circle one)

4 3 2 1

Comments:

Curriculum and Instruction

Indicator 10. Lessons in the program's classrooms reflect adult learning theory that indicates that learning is more rapid when instruction is relevant and immediately applicable to learners' lives.

Scoring Criteria

4. The lessons in the program's classrooms reflect the roles learners play as workers, family members and participants in the communities in which they are expected to communicate. Clear objectives are evident for each lesson observed, and these objectives are transferable to real-life situations. The content of lessons addresses student needs and specified priority outcomes. Instructors provide for practice and application of each lesson to students' real life tasks.

3. Clear objectives are evident for each lesson observed, and, in most cases, these objectives appear to be transferable to real-life situations, although applications may be unclear in some instances. The content of the lessons, for the most part, addresses student needs, although some of the skills taught do not appear particularly necessary to the attainment of priority outcomes.

2. Objectives for the lessons are not clear, and the content of the lessons is only occasionally transferable to real life situations. The content of the lessons may not address student needs or priority outcomes.

1. The objectives for the lessons are not clear. The content of the lessons does not seem to address student needs or priority outcomes. Application and transfer of classroom learning to the real world is limited.

Curriculum and Instruction

Sample Measures

The following are sample measures for determining the extent to which Indicator 10 is present or achieved.

Instruction in the program's classrooms is relevant and applicable to learners' daily lives as evidenced by:

- Lesson plans
- Classroom observations
- Student interviews/surveys/evaluations
- Students' examples of real life applications of learning

Overall Rating (circle one)

4 3 2 1

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Curriculum and Instruction

Indicator 11. Lessons in the program's classrooms are effectively organized and delivered.

Scoring Criteria

4. The instructor has an evident plan that guides the lesson, and sufficient time is allocated to meet objectives. There is a clear, logical, and articulated sequence of learning experiences, which focus on attainment of identified priority outcomes. Pacing is appropriate, and students are engaged in a variety of activities focused on competency attainment.

3. The instructor has a plan to guide the lesson. There is evidence of a logical sequence of learning activities. Pacing may appear either too fast or slow, as evidenced by some student frustration or inattention.

2. The instructor appears to have a lesson plan, but the lesson delivery may appear disjointed and the focus is frequently unclear and/or shows minimal relationship to attainment of a priority outcome. Pacing may create problems for student attention and comprehension..

1. The lesson does not appear to have a clear plan, focus, or sequence. There is little or no relationship of the lesson to identified priority outcomes.

Curriculum and Instruction

Sample Measures

The following are sample measures for determining the extent to which Indicator 11 is present or achieved.

- Lesson plans include an articulated sequence of learning activities.
- Classroom observations provide evidence of a logically sequenced plan.
- Student interviews/surveys/evaluations provide evidence of appropriate focus and pacing.
- Instructor self-monitoring/self-evaluation provides evidence of clear plans to guide lessons.

Overall Rating (circle one)

4 3 2 1

Comments:

Curriculum and Instruction

Indicator 12. Instructor monitoring and classroom communication activities result in a learner-centered classroom in which students take active roles in their own learning processes.

Scoring Criteria

4. Instructors make a concerted effort to encourage active participation by all students and provide feedback and positive reinforcement. Classrooms are learner-centered and collaborative, fostering student-to-student communication and positive interaction. Instructors make instructional adjustments, based on monitoring of student needs and abilities. They assist, as needed, using a variety of effective questioning and other monitoring and reinforcement techniques. Explanations are clear, and transitions between activities are smooth.

3. Most of the time, students in classes observed appear to be on task and engaged in interactive, collaborative activities. Instructors generally make effective use of positive feedback, and in most cases monitor and assist when necessary. The activities observed generally relate to the stated purpose of the lessons. The teachers make some adjustments to lessons, as needed.

2. Only a small number of students regularly and actively participate in all aspects of classroom activities. Some activities involve students in teamwork; however, students work independently much of the time. Instructors are not consistent in monitoring or providing positive feedback. The instructional plan may not be adjusted to address students' needs and abilities.

1. Classroom climate is not collaborative. Students are inattentive and most are not seriously involved in lesson activities. Students are involved in independent or total group activities most of the time. Instructors provide minimal monitoring and little positive reinforcement. No adjustments to the lesson plan are made to respond to student feedback or needs.

Classroom Instruction

Sample Measures

The following are sample measures for determining the extent to which Indicator 12 is present or achieved.

- There are classroom observations.
- Interviews with students and staff are conducted and recorded.
- Student surveys and questionnaires are kept on file.
- There is evidence of Instructor self-monitoring/self-evaluatio...

Overall Rating (circle one)

4 3 2 1

Comments:

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Classroom Instruction

Indicator 13. Instructional strategies reflect an awareness of individual student learning styles which leads to an effective learning environment.

Scoring Criteria

4. The instructors use a variety of instructional strategies such as grouping, cooperative learning, computer-assisted instruction or tutoring, depending on the objectives of the lesson, class size, and student needs or interests. These strategies also challenge students to use problem-solving and critical thinking skills. Instructors have clearly planned their lessons to ensure that a variety of learning modalities are addressed (i.e., aural/oral, visual, and kinesthetic). Group and pair work help learners acquire language while performing meaningful tasks in meaningful contexts. The modalities used clearly fit the learning objectives. Technology, if used, clearly supports the lesson objectives.

3. Instructors use some variety in grouping strategies, such as paired practice, and they alternate whole-group, small group and cooperative learning activities. Instructors attempt a variety of strategies that require the use of different sensory modalities (i.e., aural/oral, visual, kinesthetic) that address the learning objectives. Some of the activities challenge students to use higher order thinking skills. Technology, when used, supports the lesson objectives.

2. In some of the classes, teachers occasionally divide students into groups for learning activities. Teaching strategies used are not designed specifically for the encouragement of problem-solving or higher order thinking skills. The instructors may address more than one sensory modality; however, the modality used may be inappropriate to the lesson content.

1. In almost all cases, instructors employ only one grouping strategy (usually whole-group or individualized). Instructors often address only one sensory modality and do not challenge students to employ critical thinking skills. Technology, if used, may not have any relationship to attainment of the lesson objectives.

Classroom Instruction

Sample Measures

The following are sample measures for determining the extent to which Indicator 13 is present or achieved:

- There are classroom observations.
- There are interviews with students and staff.
- There are student surveys and questionnaires.
- There is evidence of instructor self-monitoring/self-evaluation.

Overall Rating (circle one)

4 3 2 1

Comments:

Student Support Services

Indicator 14. Guidance and counseling are an integral part of the agency's overall program either through direct service or through a referral network to other service providers who can serve that function. There is a process in place for the exchange of learner information among those who provide instruction, vocational training, employment referral, and/or other support services.

Scoring Criteria

4. Staff have an understanding of their responsibility for providing support to students. Clerical/counter and teaching staff are clearly informed about available program services and options. Students meet regularly with instructors and/or guidance staff. Guidance assistance is available on a daily basis. The program provides support services for students to address student needs and/or makes referrals to other service agencies if services are not directly available. The program has formal or informal linkages with other service providers to meet specific student needs such as child care, transportation, vocational training, and job referral.

3. Most guidance services are provided, although instructors, job developers or other staff members may take some or all of these responsibilities. Guidance staff are appropriately trained. Clerical/counter staff are somewhat informed about program and referral options. Guidance assistance is available on a regular basis.

2. Guidance services are provided by trained staff, but not on a regular basis. Some members of the staff are appropriately trained. Clerical/counter staff are able to provide only limited information about program and referral options. Support services and referrals are limited.

1. Few or none of the staff performing guidance services are appropriately trained. Guidance services are not readily accessible. There is no plan for providing support services. Referrals are made infrequently and not documented.

Student Support Services

Sample Measures

The following are sample measures for determining the extent to which Indicator 14 is present or achieved:

- Documented evidence of training is provided to persons responsible for guidance and counseling.
- Interviews with clerical/counter and teaching staff and students are held and recorded.
- There are meeting schedules, meeting notes, and/or agendas.
- Student folders provide evidence of counseling and guidance activities.
- Collaborative efforts and formal agreements for referrals to other educational and service agencies are documented.

Overall Rating (circle one)

4 3 2 1

Comments:

Community Involvement and Collaboration

Indicator 15. Programs enter into formal or informal collaborative agreements with potential employers, community businesses, and other agencies to promote the program mission and student/community involvement.

Scoring Criteria

4. The program collaborates, formally or informally, with potential employers, local businesses and agencies. Community leaders and representatives of business and industry serve on program advisory boards and participate in program events and other activities. Collaborative arrangements promote benefits to the community, as well as to students, including student participation as positive family members, productive workers, conscientious community members, and continuous learners.

3. There is documentation of student interactions with potential employers, businesses, and other local agencies, though formal collaborations are not in place. Formal or informal plans for increased collaboration are in evidence.

2. Planning for implementation of student community involvement and collaboration is evident. There is limited interaction with businesses or other agencies.

1. Interaction with businesses or community agencies is limited.

Community Involvement and Collaboration

Sample Measures

The following are sample measures for determining the extent to which Indicator 15 is present or achieved:

- Interviews with staff, students, and community members are held and content is used in planning.
- Schedules of meetings, meeting notes, or agendas are available to all stakeholders.
- Records of student/community involvement are kept.
- Copies of formal or informal collaborative agreements with potential employers, business and industry, community, educational and/or other service agencies are in the program files.

Overall Rating (circle one)

4 3 2 1

Comments:

Summary Profile

Indicate your agency's responses for each indicator by checking the appropriate boxes.

	Ratings			
	4	3	2	1
Program Planning				
1. Planning and review process, evaluation				
2. Staff involvement in decision-making				
Professional Development				
3. On-going professional development				
Curriculum Development				
4. Organized around student needs				
5. Appropriate to student attainment				
Assessment				
6. Student placement				
7. Monitoring progress				
Accountability				
8. Student outcomes				
Classroom Instruction				
9. Instructinal activities, communicative competence				
10. Adult learning theory, relevance of instruction				
11. Organization and delivery of instruction				
12. Instructional activites, communicative competence				
13. Learning styles, classroom environment				
Student Support Services				
14. Counseling, referral, coordination among service components				
Community Involvement and Collaboration				
15. Collaborative agreements				

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Setting Priorities

Review those indicators marked "1" or "2" on your agency's Summary Profile. List below those indicators which you consider to be the most important for improving your program.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

Review those indicators marked "3" on your agency's Summary Profile. List below those indicators which you consider to be most important for improving your program.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

From those indicators listed above, select and list below those which you consider to be your highest priority for program improvement.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

5. _____

References

The *English Language Training Program Self-Review (ELT/PSR)* was adapted from *Programs of Excellence: A Tool for Self-Review and Identification of Programs of Best Practice,* developed by The Staff Development Institute, under a grant from the California Department of Education, Youth, Adult and Alternative Educational Services Division through Federal Grant P.L. 100-297, Section 353, Sacramento, California, 1996.

Other references used in developing this document were:

Performance-Based Curricula and Outcomes, The Mainstream English Language Training Project (MELT) - Updated for the 1990's and Beyond, by Allene G. Grognet, Center for Applied Linguistics, for the Spring Institute for International Studies, ELT/TA Project under a grant from the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR), 1997.

Guidelines for ELT Programs developed by the National MELT Work Group under an ORR grant to Spring Institute for International Studies, 1988.

Self-Evaluation Instrument for Programs, SEIP-ELT, included in the MELT Resource Package developed through the Federal Office of Refugee Resettlement's Mainstream English Language Training (MELT) Project initiative of 1983.

CASAS Implementation Measure (CIM) Manual, Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System (CASAS), Foundation for Educational Achievement, San Diego, California, 1993.

Looking at Literacy: Indicators of Program Quality developed and published by the Committee on Indicators of Program Quality of the New York/New York Adult Education and Training Alliance, 1996.

"Standards for Adult Education ESOL Programs", Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL), TESOL, Inc. Alexandria, Virginia. 1995.